

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/086,497	02/28/2002	Geun-Young Yeom	YPL-0027	2173
22428	7590 08/10/2004		EXAMINER	
FOLEY AND LARDNER			ALEJANDRO MULERO, LUZ L	
SUITE 500 3000 K STRI	EET NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20007			1763	
			DATE MAILED: 08/10/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/086,497	YEOM ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Luz L. Alejandro	1763				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 20 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic I) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of	the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moterned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date or FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee of the appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	pelow);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) \square they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.				
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10. Other:	6	Derendio				
		Luz L. Alejandro Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1763				

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 10/086,497

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Kadomura does not teach the use of a purge gas supply. However, argon is a well known purge gas and therefore the purge gas supply is clearly disclosed in Kadomura.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine the references is clearly stated in the final office action mailed 4/27/04. Furthermore, attorney's arguments cannot take the place of evidence in the record.

Regarding the Motley reference, it is clear from an examination of fig. 1 of Motley that the mirror is a tiltable in a wide range of angles including the angles claimed in claim 1 of the instant application.